

Attorney Christopher Slack
Statewide Grievance Committee
287 Main Street
East Hartford, Ct. 06118

Re: Grievance Complaint #10-0716

September 13, 2010

Dear Attorney Slack:

This letter will provide greater detail on the grievance complaint form assigned case #10-0716 which has been filed at the Statewide Grievance Committee on Attorney Veronica Reich.

This letter is being sent to you in advance of the September 16 arbitrary deadline which you set for identifying a more specific complaint than the one which your form does not permit because of space limitations.

This letter from my best recollections the various in court transgressions of Attorney Reich listed on my original complaint which used the standard form to list the alleged violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

A more specific supplementary letter will be sent to the Grievance Panel which will contain the specific page numbers of court transcripts where Attorney Reich provided false information in her statements in court which involved substantial misrepresentations of fact, an effort to engage in the hiding of evidence of criminal behavior by the mother of the children Attorney Reich represented as an AMC, refusing to review evidence of such misconduct, and substantial and intentional efforts to use her position as an AMC to misstate the informed consent of her clients.

The two “litmus” tests that must be met by the Grievance Committee processes are “substantial” non-compliance with the Professional Rules of Conduct and “knowingly” making those statements to mislead tribunals.

Not only will these tests be passed in this first letter, but the “substantial” standard will be met when a second letter is sent with references to specific court motions filed which were misrepresentations in court of her own client’s statements as minor children, billing records which will support the allegations being made herein, falsified statements in court regarding meetings never held with the children in advance of hearings in which Attorney Reich participated in family court and criminal court, and efforts which Attorney Reich has made to improperly influence an expert witness testimony which violates Connecticut Statutes about witness tampering.

Attorney Reich has so abused her two minor aged clients that they wanted to “fire” her but carried no rights to do so.

Attorney Reich spoke to the psychologist of Tim Nowacki and then ignored requests of the Defendant to ask certain questions of the psychologist as it related to comments Tim made in regards to preferring to have the financial resources going to legal fees, dedicated to his education instead.

Such questions would have put Attorney Reich’s mission of using her appointment to increase her billings in conflict with her client’s mission to use those financial resources for his benefit instead.

Such conflicts of interests plagued Attorney Reich’s involvement in this case from day one of her appointment and resulted in a Motion to Dismiss her appointment which was filed on or about July 20 by this complainant and self represented party in family case FST FA 04 0201276S.

Not only has Attorney Reich abused the Rules of Professional Conduct in the course of her appointment, but she has also desiccated the Attorney’s Oath in the process:

“You solemnly swear and sincerely affirm, as the case may be that you will do nothing dishonest and will not knowingly allow anything dishonest to be done in court, and that you will inform the court of any dishonesty of which

you have knowledge; that you will not knowingly maintain or assist in maintaining any cause of action that is false or unlawful; that you will not obstruct any cause of action for personal gain or malice; but that you will exercise the office of attorney in any court in which you may practice, according to the best of your learning and judgment, faithfully to both your client and the court, so help you God, under the penalty of perjury”

Let’s face it, the profession of law has a low public esteem because lawyers are deemed as inured from accountability for their actions in court when they are less than transparent because lawyers generally do not report other lawyers for misconduct.

Therefore, when you look at the cases which are reviewed in the Grievance Committee hearings, the exception to the rule is lawyers applying the grievance process to their colleagues. The result is that the clients pay the price.

The vast majority of cases heard at the Grievance Committee for probable cause are clients who take action against unethical practices by their own attorney or the law firm for which they work.

Seldom does the Grievance Committee process handle an investigation on a complaint of unethical conduct which is lodged by an opponent to a lawyer who is Pro Se.

I have studied the ledger of complaints which are posted on the website.

With the composition of the grievance panel being two lawyers and one public member, the odds of getting a probable cause hearing by a Pro Se litigant filing a cause of action against an attorney is like the Myth of Sisyphus—pushing the rock of justice uphill is no easy task.

However, when an AMC is appointed, there is wide latitude provided to lawyers to misrepresent their clients, because their clients are not heard from directly in court.

In this case, the children are ages 14 and 12 at the time of the appointment of Attorney Reich in early July 2009. Attorney Reich not only ignored her

client's informed consent to pursue the continuation of the existing parenting plan in place, but she abused her clients by misrepresenting their desires by taking positions which were diametrically opposed to the children's expressed desires.

The plan for parenting was put in place in 2005 and was operating in the best interests of the children. Grades in school, comments from teachers, and the letters from parents who were shocked by the filing of motions to appoint a lawyer for the children and begin a battle for custody was unwarranted.

However, lawyers make money at this process and that theme is truly a public travesty of the miscarriage of the responsibilities of the AMC.

Not only have Tim Nowacki's grades plummeted, but Attorney Reich has managed to create obstacles which make her money and do not represent the vested best interests of the children.

The existing parenting plan was working; to preserve that custody arrangement would not make either Attorney Collins or Attorney Reich fee income. Such a tactic violates the Attorney's Code and malice has now become the weapon of retaliation in this case.

The nexus of the dispute was a modification of children's related expenses.

What was discovered along the way was tax fraud by the Plaintiff and her family in sequestering assets overseas to avoid paying lawful inheritance taxes. The scheme was developed by the Trustee of the Estate (Elliot Cohen) of the maternal grandmother of Suzanne Sullivan and the uncle of Suzanne Sullivan, Richard Mulligan Jr. Richard Mulligan Jr. is an attorney himself in Jackson Hole, Wyoming who advises the landed gentry on tax avoidance matters in addition to handling criminal defense cases.

Richard Mulligan Jr. and the Patricia Mulligan Sullivan were the two children of Jane O'Donnell Mulligan, who died on March 21, 2003. The Trustee of the Estate had over the years permitted Richard Mulligan Jr. to borrow \$342,000 against his future inheritance. The documents to validate these statements were acquired from the Surrogate Court in New Jersey

and a copy of the Revocable Trust Agreement of Jane O'Donnell Mulligan will be provided to the reviewing committee once this case is assigned to a Grievance Panel which is not filled with conflicts of interest.

The tax returns of Suzanne Sullivan in evidence in this case, which Attorney Reich refused to review, show on Form 1116 of the tax returns of 2006, 2007 and 2008, foreign dividend income being paid to foreign governments (various) that were not declared on the sworn financial affidavits of Suzanne Sullivan. This foreign dividend income was derived from an asset which was not declared on the financial affidavit.

That asset is the inheritance which Suzanne Sullivan and her sister Stacy Sullivan received via a generational skipping trust feature available to the mother, Patricia Mulligan Sullivan, as noted in the Revocable Trust and the last will and testament of Jane O'Donnell Mulligan signed on June 27, 2002, less than nine months before her death from cancer.

Suzanne Sullivan accepted that inheritance of zero priced shares of J&J stock which were moved overseas by the Trustee to avoid having to declare such income at the point in time of the probating of the will, which occurred in early August 2003.

Attorney Reich refused to review the financial records of even her clients—whose trust accounts were moved to the SRI group in 2006. There was no evidence which was provided to this complainant via court order to validate that the custodial accounts of Tim Nowacki and Kerry Nowacki have had income taxes paid on them since 2005, when the accounts were managed domestically by Dan Paduano at Neuberger and Berman.

Attorney Reich has refused to inspect or ask for the tax returns for the children's accounts, has refused to inspect or ask for the children's 1099's regarding the investments in those custodial accounts which are overseen by Suzanne Sullivan, and refused to investigate the origin of assets transferred into the children's accounts of zero price J&J shares.

As a result, on June 9, 2010, the Deputy Chief State Attorney's Office has opened a case of the criminal obstruction of justice on Attorney Reich,

Attorney Collins, and all those who have participated in the covering up of the legal misconduct of these Attorneys.

Lawyers cannot hide tax fraud. The Practice Book clearly says that lawyers cannot hide evidence of criminal behavior. Yet, Attorney Collins and Attorney Reich have participated in the hiding of evidence of tax fraud by failing to provide court ordered documents and the refusal to accept copies of documents which validates these allegations.

Furthermore, Attorney Reich has refused to investigate the transfer of the children's assets to a foreign country to avoid paying taxes in the United States.

Attorney Reich has participated in the failure to protect her clients interests because it would undermine the preexisting view of Attorney Reich that Suzanne Sullivan's denials of these allegations constitute the truth based on evidence.

Attorney Reich finally accepted the documents which became part of the court record on February 11, 2010 when Judge Stanley Novack was presiding on a status conference hearing which was originally scheduled with Judge Schofield, who was out ill that day.

When Attorney Reich accepted the evidence of wrongdoing on that date, she was contacted by email by this complainant. Attorney Reich's response was defensive. She wrote in an email to me that the children would go to foster care, rather than be with their father.

Such outrageous overstepping of her responsibilities to have followed the evidence rather than the misguidance being provided by Attorney Collins, who is also under a grievance complaint for the second time for filing a fraudulent financial affidavit again which failed to list the foreign dividend income and the foreign asset producing that income.

The hiding of tax fraud schemes by lawyers is even more scurrilous behavior when the assets for children are moved overseas to allow those assets to grow by failing to pay U.S. taxes on those investments.

Preserving wealth by such illegal maneuvers is being tackled at the Federal Court level (see Forbes Magazine article of August 9, 2010).

However, if lawyers at the state level are allowed to abridge court orders for production then the legal community is participating in the violation of the lawful implementation of tax laws in this country and using the attorney/client privilege in a manner inconsistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct which require lawyers, including those who sit on Grievance Complaint evaluation, to observe and protect the laws.

The Grievance Committee has a grave responsibility to report lawyers who engage in illegal behaviors from practicing law. Sequestering of evidence of wrongdoing is illegal when a court orders production of tax returns, 1099's and then lawyers attempt to cover up activities by failing to provide documents as required.

Attorney Reich has refused to review such evidence and refused to investigate matters which were outlined in the letter to Deputy Chief State Attorney Leonard Boyle.

The letter to Attorney Michael Bowler is also being provided to you which details the allegations of misconduct by the first grievance panel who did not review the evidence of misconduct by Attorney Collins with a valid panel including a public (non-lawyer) member.

Would a jury be composed of 8 members, all of whom have conflicts of interest which weren't declared and consider that a fair trial?

The Grievance Panel deliberations should consist of equal numbers of citizen members and lawyers and the ties should go to citizen making the complaint to have a public hearing of misconduct where the testimony is sworn and therefore subject to perjury allegations.

Attorney Reich will no doubt hire an attorney who will just deny these allegations. The grievance panel will have to commit hours of tedious review of evidence which consists of thousands of pages of documents which will validate my claim that Attorney Reich has acted unlawfully and therefore in non-compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Attorney Reich was not appointed as a legal guardian but as a lawyer to represent the informed consent of her two clients, Tim Nowacki, now aged nearly 16, and Kerry Nowacki, now nearly 14. Both are perceptive children, well spoken, not shy about expressing their views and clearly supported continuation on the joint legal and physical custody arrangement which benefitted their best interests in meetings held with Attorney Reich.

From the very beginning of the service of Attorney Reich as the AMC, Attorney Reich appeared to be on a mission to make money on this case by refusing to return phone calls, by creating conflict zones to increase her billings, and was determined to destroy the family infrastructure that had provided the children a balanced life where the children did not have to choose between time with both parents as evenly divided.

This father asserts he was a devoted father who volunteered for extra time with his children who benefitted from individual time with the “off primary duty” parent. By volunteering for such duty, each of the children were able to spend time with each parent and have additional attention.

Everything was copacetic with the children until Attorney Reich entered the scene. Within months of her appointment, Attorney Reich ignored her clients expressed desires and after December 27, 2009 had no contact with her clients for over six months. Yet she represented in court that she had contact which was completely fabricated commentary in court. The billing statements to be provided will validate my assertions when combined with the corresponding transcripts.

There are over 31 transcripts to make copies of in which Attorney Reich participated, hundreds of pages of emails exchanged between this complainant and Attorney Reich, and emails and letters from her clients which validate these assertions.

In addition, there are allegations of witness tampering with Dr. Kenneth Robson which will be presented in great detail in the second letter. Attorney Reich contacted Dr. Robson before he started his evaluation and attempted to create a culture of fear surrounding the Defendant, including

suggesting to Dr. Robson that his safety might be in danger before he ever initiated meetings with the Defendant as the court appointed psychiatrist.

That contact with Dr. Robson was a further illustration of Attorney Reich's ambitious campaign to influence the psychological reports of Dr. Robson.

Attorney Reich lied to the Defendant about the second visit by Suzanne Sullivan was to be scheduled with Dr. Robson in an email exchange held just after the holidays in 2009.

That second meeting didn't occur with Dr. Robson because of time constraints applied by pressure brought by Attorney Reich to issue a report which was not balanced or fair.

Dr. Robson was informed by Attorney Reich that he was not required to review evidence of misconduct and illegal conduct by Suzanne Sullivan. Such misdirection was supplied by Attorney Reich to Dr. Robson and was nothing short of witness tampering.

Attorney Reich has had continual substantial conflicts of interest in this case, from which Attorney Reich refused to step down based upon those conflicts.

Included now are the allegations made to the Chief State Attorney Kevin T. Kane, who appointed the Deputy Chief State Attorney Leonard Boyle to investigate the judges and lawyers in this case, that Attorney Reich engaged in the criminal obstruction of justice and failure to report criminal tax fraud after reviewing the evidence in this case. Three copies of the letter to Attorney Boyle are included for your review.

Attorney Reich is under investigation by the Chief State Attorney's Office and the Whistleblower Office of the IRS for her failure to report that Suzanne Sullivan, as the custodian of the accounts managed at Neuberger and Berman and transferred to the SRI group (alleged to be an offshore fund set up to sequester U.S. based assets to be transferred overseas to avoid the payment of lawful taxes in the U.S.) failed to report income taxes on the investment income of these children custodial trust accounts.

In failing to inspect the documents in question and in failing to have the competence to evaluate such documents, Attorney Reich engaged knowingly in the commission of a criminal tax fraud.

Such tax evasion was accomplished by moving the children's custodial accounts to the SRI group, thus avoiding the scrutiny of the IRS in the filing of necessary taxes on the children's custodial accounts.

Furthermore, Attorney Reich refused to inspect upon request the W-2's for the children's child care providers. Taxes were paid to Suzanne Sullivan to be filed with the proper government agencies. The withholding taxes for Hailey McMullen and Katelyn Waters for the tax year 2009 were paid to the child care providers as additional income .

No proper taxes were paid based on records made available to the Defendant even though that money was collected from the Defendant.

Attorney Reich refused to inspect those W-2's for the child care providers and then sent emails suggesting that such W-2's were seen by her.

When asked to provide a copy of those documents she inspected, Attorney Reich refused to do so.

The failure of Suzanne to file income taxes on the children's trust accounts was not investigated by Attorney Reich. Attorney Reich refused to conduct such an investigation and thus compromised her client's financial interests because the interest and penalties being accrued in the children's accounts on past due tax bills is viewed by Attorney Reich as "meaningless" to her.

Suzanne Sullivan failed to declare income on her sworn financial affidavits where foreign dividend income was not listed on a multiple sworn documents filed in court filed from June 2005 through July 22, 2010.

Those sworn affidavits are the basis on which Attorney Reich's fees were being allocated.

Attorney Reich refused to investigate the filing of the proper tax returns for her clients, refused to inspect any evidence provided to her despite offers to meet with her to review such evidence, and finally refused to question

Suzanne Sullivan or her Attorney about these tax avoidance schemes developed for the custodial trust accounts managed by the SRI Group.

This complainant asserts, Attorney Reich refused to inspect the bank records that validated the existence of a foreign account of the plaintiff because if she did so it would have required her to report such illegalities to the proper authorities.

Instead, Attorney Reich ignored the Rules of Professional conduct and actively participated in misrepresenting facts, misrepresented her clients as minor children, and filed a complaint with the Stamford Police Department for “threats and harassment” to her professional career.

The world of “half truths” is worth nothing more than the “half lies” which are going to be revealed in this complaint in detail.

The substantial non-compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct include but are not limited to:

- 1) The failure of Attorney Reich to abide by the Attorney’s Oath and do “knowingly nothing dishonest” in court without taking measures to correct such errors when they were requested to be corrected by this complainant in the Motion for Order filed by Attorney Reich on December 2, 2010 that resulted in a change of custody.
- 2) The evisceration of the Rule 1.0 (c) “Confirmed in writing” when used in reference to the informed consent of a person, denotes “informed consent” that is given in writing by the person or a writing to a lawyer properly transmits to a person confirming an oral informed consent...and if not feasible to obtain or transmit informed consent then the lawyer must obtain or transmit it within a reasonable period of time thereafter. Attorney Reich did not take notes in meetings with the children as reported to me by the children. Attorney Reich has never represented matters in court accurately in terms of the context of the conversations. The selective editing of Attorney Reich’s meetings with the children when presenting in court was not only a misrepresentation but often edited materials which preceded the selection of quotations which she then misquoted.

3) The abuse of Rule 1.0 (e) in her actions in court:

“Fraud” or “Fraudulent” denotes content that is fraudulent under the substantive or procedural law of the applicable law of the applicable jurisdiction and has a purpose to deceive.”

Attorney Reich used the fraudulently filed financial affidavit of the Plaintiff for the purposes of making false statements in court relating to the allocation of the fees of the AMC. Attorney Reich made fraudulent statements in court which dealt with the nature of her fees and their legitimacy.

Attorney Reich was accused of fraudulent conduct in the execution of her responsibilities in a lawsuit for legal malpractice filed on December 14, 2010. A new lawsuit will be commenced shortly relating to Attorney’s Reich’s involvement in the hiding of assets in a foreign country by Suzanne Sullivan, one of the two payers of the fees for her services.

The contempt motion for the payment of the fees of Attorney Reich was continued by the Court.

Attorney made absolutely false statements to the trial court in regards to fees which she “allocated” to me regarding the firm’s costs to defend itself against a lawsuit for criminal misconduct in failing to supervise the work of Attorney Reich. The costs of defending the law firm from its culpability for failure to supervise the work of Attorney Reich is the responsibility of the firm, not the client to defend themselves from the allegations of misconduct filed on December 14, 2009 by the Defendant.

The billing charges and statements made by Attorney Reich on August 6 in a hearing presided by Judge Marylouise Schofield is just another example of the “fraudulent” statements made in court by Attorney Reich.

The decision about Attorney Reich's fees has been appealed after Judge Schofield allocated over 80% of the fees to the Defendant after Attorney Reich made false statements about the estimated allocation of the time spent on matters associated with the Defendant. The Defendant time allocation by Attorney Reich was not only misstated on August 6, but did not reflect that the contested nature of Attorney Reich's misstatements and her refusal to correct them resulted in her spending more time with matters involving the Defendant.

Attorney Reich never represented her client's views of wanting the existing parenting plan to be kept intact.

In representing the opposite of the expressed desires of her clients to maintain the parenting plan, is nothing short of a fraudulent and abusive treatment of her role as an AMC.

Attorney Reich did not correct misstatements on the court record and therefore the statements which she made become "knowingly" false at the point in time that refuting evidence was supplied to her. Attorney Reich's failure to correct the record on her misstatements is not an optional exercise because it would undermine her credibility.

Instead, Attorney Reich abused the requirements stated in the Attorneys Oath which requires her to "inform the court of any dishonesty of which you have knowledge."

4) The obliteration of Rule 1.0 (f) "informed consent" which:

"denotes the agreement by a person to a proposed course of conduct after the lawyer has communicated adequate information and explanation about the material risks and reasonably available alternatives to a proposed course of conduct."

Attorney Reich failed in her duties to ever express to the court that her client's positions differed from her own. Under the provisions of

Schaeffer vs. Schaeffer, Attorney Reich was required to appoint a GAL. Attorney Reich repeatedly told me that I didn't know what I was talking about. She refused to go to the court and propose a GAL be appointed because it would decrease her influence and her fee income as she was trying to get started at her new law firm which she had just joined. There are no other lawyers who were engaging in matrimonial law at the firm of Bai, Pollock, Blueweiss and Mulcahey and Attorney Reich viewed this case as an opportunity to bill significant amounts by creating conflict zones in stepping outside the boundaries of her defined responsibilities by law.

Attorney Reich did not secure the "advised consent" of her clients; in fact she turned her back on listening to her clients and representing their preferences.

Attorney Reich instead overstepped her boundaries as defined by case law and showed her incompetency in the process.

5) Rule 1.1 Competency—

"A lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client. Competent representation requires the legal knowledge, skill, thoroughness and preparation reasonably necessary for the representation."

The first words after the perfunctory acknowledgment of her presence in the courtroom from Attorney Reich in the August 3, 2009 hearing with Judge Malone were the words, "I don't understand" the connection between foreign wire transfers and custody. This wasn't a custody matter as initiated; it was a financial matter which became a custody matter in motion filed by the Plaintiff and her Attorney on June 11, 2010. It was these four motions filed on June 11, 2010 which turned a modification of children's related expenses into a battle for custody.

The Defendant did not seek full custody because the existing joint legal and custody arrangement was working to the benefit of the best interests of the children.

However, if Attorney Reich had preserved the status quo of shared joint legal and physical custody, her fee income would not have been as high.

Attorney Reich did not understand the world of foreign accounts, foreign wire transfer fees, SWIFT networks, how to read Form 1116 of the Federal tax returns of Suzanne Sullivan and David Barrington, how to read a brokerage statement to cross reference matters to tax returns, and refused to sit with the Defendant to review evidence of criminal wrongdoing by the Estate of Jane Mulligan.

Attorney's Reich competency compromised the best interests of the children. Attorney Reich overstepped her boundaries and entered into the world of incompetency which compromised her client's best interests and increase her fee income at the expense of her client's best educational interests.

Attorney Reich did not acknowledge that by virtue of the Weinstein vs. Weinstein case overturned by Appellate Court in 1989, she had no rights to have filed a Motion for Order on an Ex Parte basis to change legal and physical custody of the children. Attorney Reich defended her actions and indicated that the Defendant was incorrect in his observations about her competency as an attorney.

Attorney Reich was not knowledgeable, made false statements in a sworn affidavit filed on December 2, 2009 and refused to correct the record when these errors were determined. Such conduct by Attorney Reich indicates that she is not competent to understand that court precedents matter in the conduct of her duties as an AMC and that she had a responsibility to go to the trial court and ask for an appointment of a GAL to represent the children's best interests.

Attorney Reich refused to ask for such an appointment until she received notice of the Deputy Chief State Attorney's investigation into her misconduct when she received a copy of the documents sent to Attorney Boyle dated June 9, 2010. Attorney Reich received a copy on June 22, 2010 of that document written to Attorney Boyle.

It was only then that a motion to appoint a GAL was filed on June 29, 2010, exactly one year from the date that the Defendant was presenting argument to Judge Malone to not release Lacey Bernier as the GAL.

6) Rule 1.2 (a) Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority between Client and Lawyer:

"subject to subsections (c) and (d), a lawyer shall not counsel a client to engage or assist a client, in conduct that the lawyer knows is criminal or fraudulent, but a lawyer may discuss the legal consequences of any proposed course of conduct with a client and may counsel or assist a client to make a good faith effort to determine the validity, scope, meaning or application of the law."

In allowing her clients to be engaging in tax avoidance schemes that will compromise the financial well being of her client's custodial accounts, Attorney Reich limited the scope of her responsibilities.

In doing so, Attorney Reich has engaged herself in the aiding and abetting of a crime with assets that are managed by the SRI group of Neuberger and Berman.

The failure of the Plaintiff to provide documentation that the tax returns of the children's accounts were filed was augmented by the refusal of the AMC to secure the information concerning the tax returns being filed by the Plaintiff who is the custodian of the account.

The Plaintiff has refused to also comply with the Separation Agreement provisions to supply an annual copy of the statements of the custodial accounts since this issue was discovered in September 2009, when the court ordered documents were turned over to me.

The custodial accounts of the children were turned over to me as well as the bank statements of the joint accounts and the individual accounts of Suzanne Sullivan and David Barrington. In none of the records turned over to me was there a validation that the tax returns of the children were filed, capital gains declared, or any payment of taxes on their trust accounts which were moved to the SRI group in 2006.

The movement of the accounts of the Plaintiff to the SRI group resulted in no income taxes paid on the sales of securities in the account numbers with Neuberger which were opened post divorce bearing the names of Suzanne Sullivan and David Barrington.

On Form 1116 of the Federal tax returns, credits were taken which relate to dividend income being paid on J&J shares which were in the account bearing the name of Suzanne Sullivan alone being held at Neuberger and Berman.

Attorney Reich in failing to investigate the sheltering of the children's custodial accounts in a foreign country post divorce and the failure of Attorney Reich to investigate on behalf of her clients the movement of that money by the custodian constitutes the abridgement of her responsibilities to protect the financial well being of those accounts in the administration of the custodian's responsibilities to pay taxes on behalf of the minor children.

Attorney Reich refused to investigate any matter which would have undermined her already stated bias towards the Plaintiff.

The constant telephone conferences between hearings with Attorney Collins suggests there was an alignment of the positions of Attorney Collins and Attorney Reich.

The refusal to meet with the Defendant to present the evidence of wrongdoing of the mother of her clients and the refusal to accept the evidence presented in court in September 2009 that validates that criminal conduct violated the responsibility of Attorney Reich to fairly evaluate “the truth” about the sequestering of the assets of her own clients.

The conduct of Attorney Reich compromised the best interests of her clients which she was obliged to uphold.

In failing to represent her clients preference for custody and misrepresenting the Defendant in the Motions for Order filed on December 2 to change custody, Attorney Reich was in clear non-compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct.

7) Rule 1.16 (a) Declining or Terminating Representation:

“Except as stated in subsection (c), a lawyer shall not represent a client or where representation has commenced shall withdraw from the representation of a client if (1) The representation will result in a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct or other law.”

Repeatedly, Attorney Reich was reminded of her responsibilities to her clients was being continuously underserved when Attorney Reich was providing misrepresentations to both family and criminal courts.

In virtually every hearing where Attorney Reich represented matters in court, Attorney Reich violated the Rules of Professional Conduct.

On December 2, 2009, there were 37 factual errors of significance that filled the 40 points she submitted in the Ex Parte Motion for Order which were never corrected on the record.

Perjury allegations were leveled against Attorney Reich for filing false affidavits about her clients preferences.

It is also believed that Attorney Reich violated under subsection (f) of Rule 1.6, which requires that an Attorney must disclose the fact that the lawyer's services are being paid by a third party. Attorney Reich's fees may have been paid via a check by Suzanne Sullivan. However, Attorney Reich never revealed to the court that Suzanne Sullivan had borrowed \$25,000 from her parents to assist in the payment of Attorney Reich's fees.

Attorney Reich's fees have been paid either directly or indirectly from funding supplied indirectly by Suzanne Sullivan's parents. Attorney Reich refused to supply the records of the payment of her fees.

The payment of Attorney Reich's fees is now under appeal with the Appellate Court because of the numerous and substantive abuse of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

Attorney Reich does not have carte blanche to file any charge she wanted to bill the Defendant, including overnight transcripts which tripled the costs allocated to the Defendant of the exorbitant fees up-charged by Attorney Reich.

Attorney Reich has repeatedly delayed reports requested to validate the fees she has billed. Attorney Reich then bills additional hours about her fraudulent bills where Attorney Reich was billing multiple parties for the same short calendar dates.

Attorney Reich refused to provide the Plaintiff with records of other clients which would indicate that she billed multiple clients for the

same time spent in court rather than allocating that time proportionately to time spent.

It wasn't until this matter was brought to her attention that Attorney Reich modified the manner in which she was allocating short calendar day hearings, where she would be working on her blackberry and responding to other client matters and then billing both clients for that time spent.

Such conduct is tantamount to overbilling more than one client at an auto body shop while charging multiple clients to watch paint dry at a per hour rate of \$425.00 per hour.

Sitting in a conference room, Attorney Reich had the guards called when I asked to speak with her about matters she refused to inspect or return calls about. Yet she would bill for that time without working on the case or would sequester herself in a conference room with Attorney Collins to discuss their legal strategies in court.

Attorney Reich was not an independent representative of the children's best interests and continually sided with each and every position staked out by Attorney Collins.

The transcripts will clearly demonstrate that Attorney Reich became an assistant counsel to Attorney Collins and in the process compromised the integrity of her responsibilities to her clients.

8) Rule 3.3 was absolutely violated by Attorney Reich on multiple occasions:

(a) "A lawyer shall not knowingly make a false statement" Attorney Reich's litany of false statements will be documented in the December 2 filing by Attorney Reich in a sworn affidavit.

An illustration of the misstatements by Attorney Reich was in the matter about contacting the State Department about dual citizenship passports. It was Attorney Reich's assistant, Linda Cino, who suggested that the State Department be contacted about such a matter.

Attorney Reich then scolded her assistant in an email saying that I had no right to address such matters with her assistant. Linda Cino was contacted regularly because Attorney Reich refused to return phone calls on a regular basis. Of course the failure to return such phone calls represents a violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

When Attorney Reich filed her Ex Parte Motion for Order to Judge Schofield on December 2, she attributed the contact with the State Department to me rather than her assistant who provided that counsel.

Such false attributions were numerous in the statements made in the Ex Parte Motion for Order filed as a sworn document by Attorney Reich. There has never been a hearing where Attorney Reich's Ex Parte Motion for Order has been able to have been challenged in Court.

9) Rule 3.3- (3)

"A lawyer shall not offer evidence known to be false."

Attorney Reich submitted false representations in court in the filing of the Ex Parte Motions for Order which attributed to her clients statements which her clients did not make. Such misrepresentations of her clients were done so with full knowledge that her statements were false and misleading.

Yet Attorney Reich showed no conscience to making such false statements under oath. Filing of false billing statements and allocating 80% of the costs of those billings was a “fabrication” of fact by Attorney Reich. Nearly half the time Attorney Reich has billed to date involved short calendar matters, not scheduled hearings. Attorney Reich continues to make false statements to protect her interests to avoid being sued for legal malpractice for the substantial misrepresentations of her clients.

- (b) “A lawyer who represents a client in an adjudicative proceeding and who knows that a person intends to engage or is engaging or has engaged in criminal or fraudulent conduct related to the proceeding shall take the responsible remedial measures, including, if necessary, disclosure to the tribunal.”

Attorney Reich refused to report Attorney Collins for his numerous and substantial misstatements of facts concerning foreign dividend bearing accounts and the asset producing that foreign dividend income for which taxes are being paid to “various” countries, as noted on Form 1116 of the joint tax returns for the years 2006, 2007 and 2008 filed by Suzanne Sullivan and David Barrington.

The refusal of Attorney Reich to review such records until February 11, 2010 resulted in significant financial damage to the educational reserves of the clients which she was obliged to serve.

Attorney Reich only realized the degree of her complicity when she read the letter sent to the Deputy Chief State Attorney Leonard Boyle on June 22, 2010. Attorney Collins refused to read or accept the same document because it would create a conflict of interest for him.

Attorney Reich’s reaction to the criminal allegations was to file a Motion to Appoint a GAL, something she refused to do in November 2009. In November 2009, Attorney Reich was accused

of having a conflict of interest with her clients when she indicated that she was supporting a change of custody, which conflicted with her clients stated position.

In emails exchanged with this complainant, Attorney Reich steadfastly refused her obligation to recognize that a GAL must be requested to be appointed in such circumstances, as dictated by the guidelines which are posted by Chief Law Librarian Lawrence Cheeseman on the official Connecticut judiciary website.

In the refusal to appoint a GAL, in a timely fashion, Attorney Reich violated her responsibilities to properly represent her clients, Attorney Reich engaged in fraudulent conduct which was designed to put her financial interests for billings to be more important than the best interests of the children.

The failure to apply the law to herself and the failure to understand that obligation was in and of itself fraudulent conduct by Attorney Reich.

On the November 3 hearing, Attorney Reich expressed in statements made on the record more concerns about the IRS matters and the impact on her career than have focused on the impact of such matters on her clients she was there to represent.

Attorney Reich refused to look at the evidence, and then improperly instructed Dr. Robson that he didn't need to review the evidence which was handed to him. Such witness tampering by Attorney Reich is illegal under Connecticut Statutes.

Dr. Robson has now been implicated in the investigation by the Chief State Attorney's Office. Dr. Robson refused to inspect the evidence provided to him of the criminal allegations of fraudulent conduct by Suzanne Sullivan which is a pattern of behavior.

Attorney Reich's participation in this cover-up is not an insignificant oversight on her part. It was a knowing effort on Attorney Reich's part to not investigate the truth about Suzanne's behavior being criminal in constitution.

10) Rule 3.3 (d):

"In Ex Parte Proceedings, a lawyer shall inform the tribunal of all material facts known to the lawyer that will enable the tribunal to make an informed decision whether or not the facts are adverse."

Attorney Reich not only made false statements knowingly on December 2, 2009 in the Ex Parte Motion for Order, but she was by court precedent not to have made such an motion to change custody. The Weinstein vs. Weinstein decision clearly limited the ability of an AMC to file such an order. However, by taking such a motion for order to a judge under judicial review and circumventing the processes of the clerk's office, Attorney Reich participated in a "custody coup" and then provided a mechanism to collect "ransom" money from the Defendant to construct parenting time with the children.

Attorney Reich's Motion for Order and resulting witness tampering with Dr. Robson and his report resulted in a decision by Judge Schofield to remove the rights of self representation for the Defendant, and thereby cancel the rights to have the Motion for Order to be heard in a timely fashion as is required by the Practice Book Rules that stipulate such Ex Parte Motions for Order to be heard in a timely fashion.

On January 4, the Defendant filed an Ex Parte Motion for Order to reverse the custody change and that hearing was set down for January 25. On January 22, Judge Schofield removed the Defendant's rights for self representation. Therefore, the Defendant

was deprived of his Constitutional Rights to parent without the unlawful interference of government and his Constitutional Rights to represent his children's future development and the Constitutional Rights of Kerry and Tim to have time with both of their parents.

Yet, Attorney Reich took matters into her own hands and misrepresented the facts in the filing of her Motion for Order.

The Defendant stood up at St. Thomas More Church to get the pastor to remove a Jesuit priest who was referenced in a criminal indictment for providing financial resources to fund a good will mission to Haitian children.

Attorney Reich suggested that the Defendant stood up while his children were present in the church. That was a patently false statement. Every single matter involving the efforts by this parent to ensure that Father Paul Carrier was removed from further contact with Tim Nowacki's confirmation class was made to protect the safety of the children.

The Executive Director of that Haiti Fund project, Douglas Perlitz, just entered plea bargain in August 2010 and will be sentenced for child molestation and sentenced on December 21.

This parent stood up to protect the children of his Parish from the false messaging of Father Paul Carrier who is under investigation for money laundering and fronting the money for the bribing of children of Haiti to buy their silence of the abuse they were suffering.

This father is also working on the discovery initiatives of fraudulent fundraising by St. Thomas More parish and the diversion of money to an alternate charity in hopes of raising the money necessary to reopen the shelter for homeless children in Cap Haitien, Haiti.

Attorney Reich refused to correct her errors in her Ex Parte Motion for Order related to this incident and instead alleged incorrectly that the children's father had humiliated them rather than seeing this as an act to protect not just my children but the children of all parishioners of the Parish.

Attorney Reich in her Ex Parte Motion for Order also misattributed comments made by Suzanne Sullivan's father to my son Tim Nowacki about the tax fraud allegations. Attorney Reich refused to investigate the source of that comment was from Jack Sullivan which she attributed this father having made to his son about his mother going to jail. Not only did Attorney Reich get the story wrong in what she reported to the court, she refused to correct her misstatements and therefore violated the Attorney's Oath in her sworn affidavit filled with 37 errors which are detailed in the preliminary lawsuit filed on December 14 for legal malpractice.

A copy of that document will accompany the second letter and the other documents detailing the level of incompetency of Attorney Reich to get facts reported correctly.

Attorney Reich ignored to mention the 37 letters which she received copies of from various people who wrote to the Superior Court judges in support of the parenting skills of this complainant. In her failure to mention these letters, Attorney Reich did not mention a single fact which was adverse to her Motion for Order and in doing so, she discredited her adherence to the Rule of Professional Conduct 3.3 (d).

11) Rule 3.4—Fairness to Opposing Party

This rule is designed to address the “falsifying of evidence” or “obstruct” the discovery of evidence which is relevant to the case.

Attorney Reich's refusal to pursue a course of action to validate the allegations of foreign accounts held by her own clients and the lawful payment of taxes related to the custodial responsibilities of Suzanne Sullivan to manage those accounts in a lawful manner created significant allegations that Attorney Reich was not operating in fairness to this parent, who became an opposing party to the actions taken by Attorney Reich to modify custody without a hearing.

The Weinstein vs. Weinstein decision made by the Appellate court in 1989 (18 Conn. App 622, 561, A.2d 443)(emphasis added) "NO AUTHORITY IS GIVEN to court appointed counsel to issue orders affecting parties or their children or to resolve, in quasi-judicial fashion disputes between the parties concerning their children."

Attorney Reich operated outside of her boundaries of her responsibilities and thereby violated the advised consent rules which are not voided because of the age of the children, which approach emancipation ages.

Attorney Reich's Motion for Order violated the parameters of her appointment.

One week after the first Ex Parte Motion for Order, Attorney Reich attempted a second such action and was refused by Judge Harrigan on December 8 from a similar petition of the Court. Attorney Reich's credibility as an attorney was under siege and Attorney Reich assumed a position of protecting her relationship with the minor children at the expense of the relationship with their father. Such was the enormous ego of Attorney Reich regarding her perceived role as an AMC.

Attorney Reich is a lawyer, not a guardian of any kind who has been legally appointed to have the kind of authority she has exercised and how she has misrepresented her clients and their wishes.

Such conduct is abuse of Kerry Nowacki and Tim Nowacki and Attorney Reich has engaged in parental alienation which was prohibited in the Separation Agreement provisions of the parenting plans.

Attorney Reich engaged in evidence suppression in her refusal to turn over exculpatory evidence contained in 5 hours of conversations on CD's with Kerry Nowacki and Tim Nowacki. Attorney Reich insisted on screening the tapes, charging for reviewing them, and then denied my rights to a copy of such evidence without paying fees to debate the delivery of the tapes to me.

When it came to fairness matters to the opposing party, Attorney Reich in the filing of an Ex Parte Motion for Order eliminated all exculpatory evidence which would have undermined her position. In her refusals to turn over evidence that would exonerate the Defendant from her bias, Attorney Reich violated the Professional Rules of Conduct.

12) Rule 3.4 (7)

“ No lawyer shall present, participate in presenting or threaten to present criminal charges solely to obtain and advantage in a civil matter.”

On December 14, Attorney Reich conspired with Attorney Collins to have me arrested for writing emails to Attorney Reich where she charged me with a criminal act in retribution for taking civil actions against Attorney Reich.

As I was walking into the court in Stamford on December 14, she and Attorney Collins conspired to orchestrate my arrest so that Attorney Collins could try and incorporate that matter into the court record of December 14. Judge Schofield waived the attorney fees for Attorney Reich when it was revealed that I had agreed to pay my share of

Attorney Reich's fees and suddenly it dawned on Judge Schofield that the two attorneys had orchestrated my arrest to increase the fees of Attorney Reich.

Attorney Reich refused to provide me with documents associated with the allegations and those were not provided to me until December 28. Those emails will be provided to you as will the statement of Attorney Reich which was not provided to me until a later date.

The criminal charges which Attorney Reich leveled against me have been used by Attorney Collins in the civil case. There is no validity to the claims of Attorney Reich and they relate to the threats against her career in a civil matter.

However, perjury is a criminal charge and Attorney Reich's fraudulent sworn affidavit was made under the penalty of perjury. The abjectly false statements made by Attorney Reich are not just perjury on face value but represent perjury in the context of the Attorney's Oath.

Upon review of the emails, there were an equal number of insults being hoisted by both sides after Attorney Reich continued on the path to deconstruct her client's relationship with their father.

The alienation of a parent from any child would be considered abuse and depraved indifference to the needs of all children to have the unconditional love of both parents. Tim and Kerry Nowacki had the benefit of the unconditional love of both parents; due to the actions of Attorney Reich they have been stripped of the unconditional love of their father by the restrictions concerning parenting time involving just the father.

Attorney Reich's actions of filing criminal charges tied to a civil matter not only was not in the best interests of the children, but has been used as commentary by Attorney Collins to attempt to degrade the father of Kerry and Tim Nowacki, who loves his children without conditions.

Rule 3.5—Impartiality and Decorum

Attorney Reich showed a bias from the first meeting with the Defendant and her partiality continues to permeate the proceedings in both criminal and civil court. Attorney Reich even forwarded false information to the State Attorney's Office to attempt to improperly advise State Attorney Mary SanAngelo and others to make false statements to the tribunal.

Such conduct by Attorney Reich was just as reprehensible as her many diatribes against the Defendant, claiming he was "ill", "sick" and made disparaging comments to the children about their father.

Furthermore, Attorney Reich even offered legal advice to one of the nannies, Katelyn Waters, concerning the signing of an employment agreement which Katelyn Waters agreed to upon her employment on October 29, 2009. Katelyn Waters signed the agreement on January 1, 2010 against the advice of Attorney Reich who then billed the parents for the advice which she offered to the nanny which was completely inappropriate interjection of her opinions in matters which were not a function of the appointment of Attorney Reich.

Attorney Reich's decorum and behavior was obstreperous in its basic constitution, demeaning to the intelligence and perceptiveness of this complainant, and degrading to his determination to fight against the forces of fear which Attorney Reich tried to instill in the children of their father and attempted to instill in Dr. Robson's report.

A copy of my response to Dr. Robson's report will be included in the materials to be presented to the grievance panel. Due to HIPA rules, the release of Dr. Robson's report is not considered appropriate without seeking the consent of both parents and Dr. Robson based upon rules of the American Psychological Association Rules of Conduct.

“A lawyer shall not communicate in an ex parte manner with a judges, jurors, prospective jurors or other court officials unless permitted by court order or law.”

“A lawyer shall not communicate in ex parte conversations with such persons during a proceeding unless permitted by law or by court order.”

In filing an Ex Parte Motion for Order directly with Judge Schofield and circumventing the court clerk’s office, Attorney Reich violated these provisions of the Rules of Professional Conduct. Further violations occurred when Attorney Reich attached a sworn affidavit which was filled with errors.

14) Rule 4.1—Truthfulness in Statements to Others

“A lawyer shall not

(1) Make a false statement of material fact or law to a third person.”

(2) Fail to disclose a material fact when disclosure is necessary to avoiding or assisting of a criminal or fraudulent act by a client unless disclosure is prohibited by Rule 1.6”

Attorney Reich’s made false statements to me during the course of these proceedings involving matters of law which related to her responsibilities as an AMC in this case.

The refusal of Attorney Reich to inspect evidence of wrongful management of the children’s trust accounts by Suzanne Sullivan is an example of a failure to disclose a material fact which avoided or assisted in a criminal or fraudulent act as a custodian for the children’s accounts.

Attorney Reich was adamant that she had no obligation to reveal to the court even after February 11, 2010 when she was provided that evidence in court.

Furthermore, when Attorney Reich received the letter sent to Attorney Leonard Boyle, the Deputy Chief State Attorney appointed to investigate these allegations of wrongdoing, she did not view this as a conflict of interest of a substantial nature as defined in the 1.7 Conflict of Interests.

Instead, Attorney Reich filed a motion for the court to appoint a GAL, one year to the date when Attorney Reich replaced GAL Lacey Bernier, who resigned the case after she became aware of the existence of a foreign account from which GAL Bernier may have been paid.

The failure to disclose material facts which would have exonerated the Defendant from false allegations made on February 22, 2010 to the NCPD is just another example of how Attorney Reich failed to disclose material facts and evidence in her possession.

The consistent misrepresentations as demonstrated on December 2 Motion for Order filled with 37 errors will be filed with the evidence and the secondary letter to accompany that evidence of the misconduct allegations of Attorney Reich.

15) Rule 5.1—Responsibility of Partners, Managers and Supervisory Lawyers

From the conversations had with the one partner who actually spoke with me about the lack of adherence to the Rules of Professional Conduct, Attorney Reich appeared to shield her supervisors and partners from the status update on this contested matter.

Attorney Reich refused to allow for time to be spent on questions raised by the Defendant, and created conflict zones by creating artificial barriers to parenting time with her clients. Attorney Reich was unwilling to modify her own structure created for parenting time which would require the Defendant to hire a monitor at \$100 per hour plus travel time.

She selected a monitor who was on another case with Attorney Collins whose travel time would be paid at \$85.00 per hour. Attorney Reich seemed to believe she was providing a service to the Defendant by selecting a monitor with the greatest travel time required.

Attorney Reich refused to allow for time to be spent on Christmas day with his children at the home of the Defendant, yet Attorney Reich was willing to allow the children to spend time with their father at someone else's home on Christmas day. Attorney Reich's entire strategy was to create a setting for the children so that in order to accomplish seeing the children, Attorney Reich would make money during the process.

The children refused such monitored parenting time as being unnecessary and uncomfortable for them to have gone from joint legal and physical custody on one day and the next day be forced to have monitored parenting time with an absolute stranger.

Attorney Reich's conduct was apparently never supervised in the filing of an Ex Parte Motion for Order. As a result, Attorney Reich was a renegade lawyer who was allowed to be a "bull in a china shop."—unruly and unmonitored by her partners.

Attorney Reich never had any communication with her clients from early January 2010 until June 2, 2010, yet she represented in hearings in March that she had spoken to her clients when in fact she had not. Attorney Reich got caught in her own web of lies and those

of Attorney Collins who even lied to Judge Schofield to get a hearing moved because Attorney Collins had a conflict on his calendar which could have been filled by his associate counsel Attorney Ami Jayne Wilson.

Attorney Collins walked into the Judge Schofield's chambers and was provided Ex Parte access which showed an access which was not provided to a Pro Se representative.

There appeared to be no supervision of Attorney Reich's conduct by her supervisors, partners or managers at any time.

16) Rule 8.4: It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

- 1) "Violate or attempt to violate the Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so through the acts of another"
- 2) "Commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or a fitness as a lawyer in other respects"
- 3) "Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentations"
- 4) "Engage in conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice"
- 5) Knowingly assist a judge or a judicial officer in conduct that is a violation of applicable rules of judicial conduct or other law

Based upon the forgoing observations as indicated on the following transcript dates Attorney Reich was in non-compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct on the following dates:

1. August 3, 2009, November 2, November 3, November 23, December 2 (Judge Adams and Judge Schofield Courtrooms),

December 14, January 5, January 19, January 22, February 11, February 19, March 18 (Judge Dennis), March 29, May 17, June 15, June 16, June 22, June 25 (Judge Grogins), July 6, July 14, July 19, July 23, July 24, August 6, August 13, Attorney Reich made false statements on the court record which will be marked in yellow highlighted markers on those transcripts that will “yellow line” the misstatements of fact and refuting documents will be presented to contest the authenticity of comments made by Attorney Reich on behalf of her client’s informed consent.

Attorney Reich assisted Attorney Collins in making false statements by reinforcing those false statements.

Attorney Reich improperly hid evidence of perjured financial affidavits by refusing to inspect evidence presented in three hearings on September 16, 24 and 30th for which Attorney Reich was not present at those financial related hearings tied to the modification of the children’s related expenses.

Attorney Reich in refusing to inspect evidence of mismanagement of the custodial accounts of her clients participated in a series of illegal maneuvers in court by Attorney Collins to sequester that evidence from discovery despite a court order to produce those documents was not complied with by Attorney Collins.

Attorney Reich refused her responsibility to properly represent the informed consent of her clients in a forthright manner. By filing a Motion for Order which violated the boundaries of her responsibilities as defined by Weinstein vs. Weinstein, Attorney Reich violated the very essence of representation---which that a lawyer works for her clients, not for their own financial gain which has compromised the educations of the clients she is required to serve.

Attorney Reich's misrepresentations of her clients positions are numerous and accretive to the pain and suffering brought to this parent and to the clients which she is obligated to serve. Attorney Reich's conduct has been knowingly dishonest, fraud, deceit and misrepresentations of her clients.

Attorney Reich appointed herself to a position to which she was not asked to fill—that of being a parent to Kerry Nowacki and Tim Nowacki, who asked for Attorney Reich to be replaced through communications with their father. Attorney Reich then claimed this parent was interfering with the relationship of the Attorney with his children when in fact the Attorney was interfering with the relationship of this father with his children and was making money in creating that conflict which did not exist.

Attorney Reich tampered with an expert witness in contacting Dr. Robson and suggesting that Dr. Robson was in some sort of danger in the future contact with the Defendant, thus inappropriately interfering with the objectivity in Dr. Robson's report as noted on page one of Dr. Robson's report.

Attorney Reich lied to this parent in regards to the second visit of Suzanne Sullivan with Dr. Robson. Attorney Reich did not return the phone call saying that she would look into it. By then Dr. Robson was informed by Attorney Reich that the report did not require that the evidence provided to Dr. Robson was not required to be inspected.

In providing such misdirection to Dr. Robson, Attorney Reich has now endangered Dr. Robson's status as a licensed practitioner because he allowed Attorney Reich to penetrate the Rules of Conduct which governed Dr. Robson's evaluation. Attorney Reich actually argued in court that Dr. Robson was a psychiatrist and therefore the 51 page letter of complaint about the inaccuracies of his report should not be entered as evidence in the hearing held on

August 6 about the restoration of the Defendant's rights of self representation.

The absurdity of Attorney Reich's position inasmuch as every psychiatrist must be licensed to practice by the state chapters of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Psychologist Association.

The lack of competency of Attorney Reich was stunning to this complainant and her attempts to suppress information which would invalidate the improper interference with Dr. Robson's independence is an example of how Attorney Reich tried to suppress evidence which could exonerate the Defendant from the allegations erroneously made in the conclusions of Dr. Robson and Dr. Stoll's report. A copy of that document will accompany the evidence and transcripts of the hearings.

All of the hearings involving Attorney Reich and the Motion to Request the dismissal of Attorney Reich for Contempt of her responsibilities to protect the best interests of the children and to represent the children's "voice" in an accurate manner have been ordered and will be delivered as they are delivered to the complainant.

The religious discrimination exhibited by Attorney Reich however is amply demonstrated in the manner in which Attorney Reich mocked the deep religious beliefs of the Defendant and his pursuit of a truthful reporting of matters in court by Attorney Reich.

Attorney Reich has attempted to interject her values of moral relativism in the lives of her clients via the actions she has initiated. Such actions by an attorney to disrespect the values and the norms of the family heritage of the surname of Nowacki was often mocked by Attorney Reich in court and in emails sent to this complainant. Dr. Robson's report and testimony also engaged in

religious commentary which smacked of religious discrimination promoted in the questions asked of Dr. Robson as well.

Such discriminatory commentary by Attorney Reich was positioned by Attorney Reich in a derogatory manner and has no place in a courtroom of law where civil and constitutional rights must be protected.

Finally, Attorney Reich's ex parte conversations with Judge Schofield on December 2 is a righteously indignant abrogation of the Rules of Professional Conduct in going around a proper hearing and cross examination of her sworn affidavit. The errors in that filing alone contained 37 misstatements of facts and attributions which have yet to be corrected by Attorney Reich.

The Attorney's Oath has been violated by Attorney Reich in the process of not correcting those errors and the Rules of Professional Conduct have been defaced by her conduct.

A lawyer must be held accountable in a public hearing for probable cause based upon the substantial allegations which will be supported by the emails and the transcripts which will validate all of the above allegations made in the violations of the Rules of Professional Conduct as outlined above.

Attorney Reich has abused her discretion in her appointment as an Attorney for the Minor Children.

This letter gives considerable background on my allegations that Attorney Reich has demonstrated a depraved indifference in the conduct of her duties representing the "best interests" of Tim Nowacki, born November 1, 1994 (at the time of her appointment 15) and Kerry Nowacki, born November 8, 1996. Depraved indifference to a child's needs and

aspirations is tantamount to allegations of child abusive behavior by Attorney Reich in the conduct of her responsibilities.

Attorney Reich, at no point in time has represented the “informed consent” of her clients in the conduct of her duties to represent the children’s best interests.

Attorney Reich has abused her responsibilities to represent what the children asked her to represent in court: that the children wanted to preserve the joint legal and physical custody arrangement which was put in place by agreement of the parents on January 18, 2005.

Attorney Reich must be held accountable for the damage done to the clients to whom she was to have represented in court. Instead, Attorney Reich did not keep in touch with her clients, as noted on her bills.

Attorney Reich in a hearing on March 18, represented that she had spoken to Tim Nowacki, and her bills clearly indicated that she had no such conversations about Tim’s father attending the State semi-finals of the high school hockey championships being played at Yale even if accompanied by an off duty police officer.

The bias and misrepresentations Attorney Reich must be held accountable for in a public hearing of probable cause for misconduct upon the review of the validation of these allegations via evidence to be reviewed once a proper grievance committee is assigned.

Attorney Reich has therefore conducted herself as an AMC in a manner inconsistent with the Appellate court rulings such as Weinstein vs. Weinstein which deals with the boundaries of Attorneys who are appointed for children. Attorney Reich believes that immunity is granted to an AMC appointment. However, no lawyer is exempt from the consequences of the invalidation of the Professional Rules of Conduct.

Attorney Reich was appointed by Judge Malone Robert Malone on or about July 3, 2009 after four motions were filed on June 11, 2009 by the Plaintiff, and her Attorney Kevin F. Collins.

Those four motions were: A Motion for Order to appoint an Attorney for the Minor Children, A Motion to Order a Psychological Evaluation of Both Parents, A Motion for Order to Modify Custody, and a Motion for Order to Show Cause.

On June 29, 2009 Judge Robert Malone presided on a hearing where the GAL, who structured the custody plan, Lacey Bernier resigned as the GAL against the objection of this father. Lacey Bernier had structured the parenting plan which was signed by the parents on January 18, 2005 and incorporated into the Separation Agreement signed on June 29, 2005.

Copies of all the supporting documents, including court transcripts will accompany the complaint at which point it time that this complaint is assigned to a Grievance Committee Panel.

The Statewide Grievance Committee must provide assurances to this complainant that conflicts of interest statements will be signed by those sitting on this evaluation. The Statewide Grievance Committee was requested in a letter to Attorney Howard Emond to assign this complaint to an geographic area where there is no past working or in court relationship is in existence between Attorney Reich and anyone sitting on her Grievance Panel.

All of these conflicts of interest provisions were set out in a letter sent to both Attorney Michael Bowler and Attorney Howard Emond. Attorney Bowler is under a Grievance filing by this complainant for failing to administer to the proper constitution of a grievance panel.

The parenting plan which was in place for five years was benefitting the children's best interests. The report cards of the children, the comments from their teacher's and coaches, the parent letters which were given to Attorney Reich to review, and every other measurement criteria that validated that the shared joint legal and physical custody arrangement

Of course, preserving the existing custody arrangement would not make Attorney Reich money. Since Attorney Reich had just changed legal firms

this was one of the first cases that she exploited to increase her fee income at the expense of her client's best interests.

Attorney Reich had just moved to the law firm of Bai, Pollock, Blueweiss and Mulcahey. In fact the judicial notice of her appointment as the AMC on this case went to the wrong law firm.

The transcript of the June 29, 2009 hearing will show that GAL Lacey Bernier provided less than authentic testimony under oath. Lacey Bernier indicated an intent to resign two weeks after she was noticed in an email from me on that Attorney Tom Colin had resigned as the legal counsel of Suzanne Sullivan within 24 hours after he was confronted with the existence of evidence that Attorney Colin was aware of a Swiss Bank account which the Plaintiff did not acknowledge on her financial affidavit.

On March 12, Lacey Bernier was also noticed via email of the existence of a foreign account which resulted in Attorney Colin's resignation as Suzanne Sullivan's Attorney. Lacey Bernier noticed her intent to withdraw as a GAL on March 26, just after Attorney Collins filed an appearance on March 9 to be the Attorney to replace Attorney Collins.

On June 29, Lacey Bernier was on the witness stand and was questioned about her statements that she had nothing to do with this case since 2005. As recent as February 2009, Lacey Bernier was involved in helping to assist the setting up of court appointments with Attorney Colin and the Defendant, as Pro Se.

On August 3, there was a hearing conducted by Judge Robert Malone in regards to a number of outstanding issues relating to her appointment including a Motion to Dismiss Attorney Reich's appointment. A review of that motion will reveal that many of the observations of the Defendant have been proven to be true over the course of the next year.

In addition, the August 3 hearing dealt with many matters including the first acknowledgment of the Whistleblower complaints filed with the IRS on July 2, relating to the inheritance received by Suzanne Sullivan from the estate of Jane O'Donnell Mulligan. The Defendant asserted that Attorney Collins

was refusing to provide the documents ordered by the court because he was hiding the evidence of inheritance and estate tax avoidance in the sequestering of assets overseas to avoid discovery during the original divorce proceedings.

The August 3 hearing not only involved attempts to get the court to force the Defendant into signing a confidentiality agreement that would have potentially implicated the Defendant in hiding fraud, but also dealt with the payment of Attorney Reich and the filing of a valid financial affidavit.

Plaintiff came to court on August 3 with a falsely sworn affidavit which was four months outdated and Attorney Collins attempted to submit an outdated affidavit even for the Defendant. Plaintiff did not declare a \$75,000 bonus she had received on July 30, even though the affidavit was signed on August 3.

A new affidavit was produced by the Plaintiff on August 7, which was signed by Attorney Ami Jayne Wilson. The affidavit which did not include foreign dividend income or the asset producing the foreign dividend income was never corrected until Attorney Collins was mandated to deliver a new financial affidavit dated July 1, 2010. That affidavit was fraudulent inasmuch as it did not include the foreign dividend income and the asset producing that income.

Attorney Collins and Attorney Reich received a letter on or about July 10, where both Attorneys were noticed there would be a no tolerance policy about filing another fraudulent financial affidavit which had been ordered to be produced on July 14.

Attorneys Collins and Reich did not respond to the certified letter sent to them. Attorney Reich's complicity was defined when she failed to recognize in the filing of a fraudulent financial affidavit which did not include the foreign dividend income and the asset producing it, that the Plaintiff and her attorney had filed a fraudulent affidavit.

The failure of Attorney Reich to call attention to the filing of an affidavit which was fraudulent and being used to allocate her fees is another example of “enabling” another attorney in filing a fraudulent affidavit.

Such complicity in violations of Rules of Professional Conduct was apparent in a considerable number of hearings where both Attorneys appeared. The lack of coordination of preparation was apparent on March 29, when Attorney Wilson appeared on behalf of Attorney Collins.

In that hearing, the misuse of Dr. Robson’s report was transmitted to Judge Schofield and Attorney Wilson was instructed to deliver a message to Attorney Collins that use of a report which was never cross examined in court and therefore not validated, was an unlawful use of the report under HIPPA guidelines.

Attorney Reich’s first comments on August 3, 2009 indicated that she did not have the competence necessary to be an Attorney in this case, representing the children, when she said: “I don’t understand”.

Attorney Reich lacked the competency to understand the implications of tax avoidance and perjured financial affidavits filed by the Plaintiff and her Attorney.

When Attorney Reich met with the Defendant in offices in Stamford in August it was apparent to this Pro Se that Attorney Reich did not understand that the children’s trust accounts had been moved overseas to preserve assets in their trust accounts.

Attorney Reich was requested in August to investigate this matter involving the children’s trust accounts for which Suzanne Sullivan was custodian. Attorney Reich refused to investigate the illegal moving of accounts of the children to avoid paying lawful taxes in the United States.

Attorney Reich therefore in this complaint is being alleged to have participated in the cover-up of a crime starting in August 2009 and continuing up to the present.

Attorney Reich, after the evidence of wrongdoing was introduced in court hearings as evidence on September 16, 24 and 30 in hearings presided by Judge Stanley Novack , in late September 2009 and again after returning from vacation in late October 2009, refused to review the evidence presented in court of these criminal allegations concerning tax fraud.

All of this is captured in emails to Attorney Reich which commenced in great urgency and ignored by Attorney Reich. On October 30, 2009, Attorney Reich was notified that she had been reported to the Whistleblower Office in Washington for her role in hiding the tax avoidance in moving inheritance assets overseas to avoid discovery and the lawful payment of taxes on J&J shares.

Even more grievous was Attorney Reich's misrepresentations in court of her client's desires to continue with the existing legal and physical custody arrangements in place benefitting the children's best interests.

When Attorney Reich met with the children to discuss their preferences concerning the parenting plan in September 2009, both children indicated to her that they wanted to preserve the existing custody plan.

At no point in time, in any court session, has Attorney Reich ever communicated to the court that the children wanted to keep the parenting plan in place—without modification.

Furthermore, Attorney Reich refused to investigate the third party alienation which was being conducted by the father of the Plaintiff, Jack Sullivan.

Tim Nowacki started to act rather bizarrely with his father. After observing the change of behavior, Tim admitted that his grandfather said that Tim's father was trying to get everyone in the family thrown in jail.

When the Defendant found out about this third party alienation, Attorney Reich was contacted and asked to investigate this third party alienation.

Attorney Reich refused to investigate this request about third party alienation. The parenting plan and the Separation agreement which was signed by both parents addresses the subject of parental alienation.

In each and every request made by the Defendant to investigate either criminal behavior by the Plaintiff and to investigate the attempts of Tim's grandfather to alienate Tim against his father, Attorney Reich said that she was not required to do anything which I requested her to do.

Yet, Attorney Reich's billing records indicate an open access for Attorney Collins to speak with Attorney Reich on legal strategies all the time. Attorney Reich was not a neutral party to the proceedings in and out of court and it became apparent to this parent that Attorney Reich was out to increase her fee income at the expense of the best interests of the children.

Attorney Reich refused to look at all evidence which was marked as evidence. Attorney Reich refused to speak to Tim about the conversations with his grandfather.

When Attorney Reich appeared in court on November 2 and November 3, Attorney Reich had been notified that she had been reported to the IRS under the Whistleblower laws established in 2006, which allowed citizens to report allegations of tax fraud to the government for investigation.

In the hearings on November 2 and November 3, it was apparent that Attorney Reich had spoken to Attorney Collins about the reporting of Attorney Collins for non-compliance with the Rules of Professional Conduct inasmuch as Attorney Collins was hiding the evidence of tax avoidance and tax fraud.

On July 2, 2009, Attorney Collins was cited in a contempt motion (Motion 211) for the failure to comply with the court orders to produce production without a confidentiality agreement which Attorney Collins was attempting to get the Defendant to sign.

On October 13, 2009, Motion 217 after Judge Michael Shay refused to hear Motion 211. Judge Shay indicated that the Defendant had to resubmit the Motion and take it to Judge Robert Malone who had made a decision on August 13 to issue a Protective Order on the production issued by Judge Shay.

Motion 217 addressed the subject of the non-declaration of the foreign dividend income and the failure to disclose that income as well as the asset producing the foreign dividend income which was listed on Form 1116 of the Plaintiff's tax returns. The tax returns of 2006, 2007 and 2008 are all in ID exhibit status in the court record and the appropriate pages of the tax return will be submitted to the Grievance Panel as evidence that all of the financial affidavits filed since October 2008 were fraudulent documents.

Attorney Reich refused to join the Defendant at the clerk's office to review evidence of filing fraudulent financial affidavits in advance of the hearings on November 2 and November 3.

Attorney Collins grievance with the Statewide Grievance Committee was filed on October 21 and assigned to the Stamford/Norwalk grievance panel.

Judge Schofield was noticed of her Judicial misconduct grievance on November 20, 2009 by certified mail from Executive Director of the JRC, Peter Clark.

The retaliations by Judge Schofield and the two attorneys commenced almost immediately after the grievances were filed.

Attorney Reich had already joined forces with Attorney Collins by November 2 and in doing so engaged in conduct which compromised her client's best interests by refusing to inspect the evidence of tax avoidance in the Plaintiff's tax returns and the children's custodial accounts. Suzanne Sullivan, the Plaintiff is the custodian on these accounts being held in the SRI group.

Attorney Reich refused to inspect the bank statements of the Plaintiff which showed no demonstration that taxes had been paid on the sale of securities in the children's accounts since 2006 when the children's accounts were moved into the SRI group.

The tax returns of Suzanne Sullivan and David Barrington (they were married in August 2006) do not list dividend income from the assets that they held in the SRI group on the dividend income statements of their joint tax returns for 2006, 2007 and 2008.

Even if her client's money was involved in a tax avoidance scheme, Attorney Reich refused to ask for the tax returns for her clients when she was requested to do so. If the activity was criminal, Attorney Reich would not investigate any matter involving the Plaintiff or Attorney Reich's client's accounts at Neuberger and Berman.

In the hearing held on November 3, the transcript showed that Attorney Reich did not mention the best interests of the children, but spend significant time on the record dealing with her potential legal liability for having been reported to the IRS for Attorney Reich's role in hiding the assets of the children's custodial account in a foreign country to avoid paying lawful taxes in the United States.

Attorney Reich was asked to find out if some other person was paying the taxes on the children's trust accounts. Attorney Reich refused every request made of the Defendant.

Instead, on November 3, Attorney Reich focused on the appointment of a psychological evaluation of both parents. Attorney Reich made no reference to the preferences of the children to not make a change in custody in the hearings on November 2 and 3. Attorney Reich appeared to be on a course of action to participate in the deconstruction of the parenting plan which was serving the best interests of the children.

Attorney Reich not only failed her clients expressed consent to pursue the preservation of the existing shared legal and physical custody arrangements, but also failed in her duties to uphold the Rules of Professional Conduct in the manner in which she conducted her role.

Attorney Reich was not appointed as a Guardian of the Children. She was appointed as the legal representative of the children and was obliged to maintain a position of neutrality on any dispute with the parent. The Weinstein and Weinstein decision indicated very clearly that Attorney Reich was not to make no Motions for Order and to not resolve any dispute between the two parents.

Attorney Reich refused to consider her client's state preferences in court and instead embarked on a campaign to raise her fees by supporting the Plaintiff's motions in virtually every court hearing in which she participated.

The lack of neutrality of Attorney Reich was clear from the first hearing and meeting with the Defendant. Attorney Reich lacked the competence to review a tax return. Attorney Reich was well aware that if she promoted conflict, her fee income would increase.

Attorney Reich suggested in a series of emails with the Defendant that this father had no right to ask her client's about the meetings held with Attorney Reich to verify that the children had requested that she represent in court that the children wanted no change in the current parenting plan.

Attorney Reich lied to the court in her representations on numerous occasions. Attorney Reich lied to the Defendant on numerous occasions and repeatedly got caught on emails playing the foil for Attorney Collins.

The notice of Attorney Collins' case being assigned to the Stamford/Norwalk Grievance Panel and Attorney Eugene Riccio was appointed to be the legal counsel for the Grievance Panel. Communications were to be held only with Attorney Riccio.

The topic of the Grievance filed against Attorney Collins became a cause célèbre in court.

When Judge Marylouise Schofield, Judge Malone and Judge Shay were cited on November 10 in a letter to the Judicial Review Council for the hiding of the evidence of tax fraud in their refusal to hear Motion 217, the battle lines were firmly drawn that this citizen was determined to expose the insider trading that goes on in family court in Stamford.

Judge Schofield began to interject herself in hearings where she had no prior involvement.

During the month of November, Attorney Reich and the Defendant exchanged a number of very antagonistic emails regarding her failure to represent the best interests of the children. It was obvious that Attorney

Reich was interested in elevating her fee income and would be willing to sacrifice her client's interests to accomplish her goal.

Attorney Reich knew by commissioning a psychological evaluation of the parents that it would increase her fee income by prolonging the processes.

The Defendant objected to the misrepresentations made by Attorney Reich on November 2, 3, 23 made in court. Misrepresentations were that the Defendant was using the IRS to intimidate Attorney Reich.

For instance, Attorney Reich was informed after the fact about being reported to the IRS for her role in the hiding of tax fraud in the children's accounts. The Defendant was justifiably upset that the AMC would have extensive conversations with Attorney Collins and then act in concert with him and fail to return phone calls of the Defendant which requested Attorney Reich investigate illegal conduct by the Plaintiff.

On November 23, 2010, Attorney Collins suggested the grievances which were filed against the judges and Attorney Collins were done to try and construct a scenario where only Judge Novack could hear motions in Stamford.

The reason why the grievances were filed was because of unethical conduct which was being observed in and out of court by Attorney Collins, Attorney Reich and the judges in the case who were involved in the sequestering of evidence of foreign assets not declared in the financial affidavits filed by the Plaintiff and her Attorneys.

Filing a perjured financial affidavit is illegal and violates the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The Defendant filed an appeal on the appointment of Dr. Robson. Attorney Reich took umbrage to that appeal being filed.

The Defendant objected to the appointment of Dr. Robson. Defendant asserted in court that the Defendant wanted his sessions with the psychologist taped—in the same way that a deposition would record the

sessions with Dr. Robson that would then provide a benchmarking tool for a cross examination of the expert witness.

Attorney Reich then misreported to the court that I wanted all sessions to be taped in statements made to the court in a Ex Parte Motion for Order to change custody which Attorney Reich filed on December 2.

On December 2, 2010, the lack of ethical conduct of Attorney Reich was demonstrated clearly.

First, Attorney Reich worked in concert with Attorney Kevin Collins and Judge Marylouise Schofield to pull off a “custody coup” on December 2, 2010, against the will of her own clients.

On the morning of December 2 came to court with an Ex Parte Motion for Order to a custody change which violated the boundaries of the role of an AMC. The Appellate Court ruling in Weinstein vs. Weinstein defined the following in its ruling:

Despite multiple appeals made by the Defendant to the AMC, Attorney Reich refused to appoint a GAL to represent the children’s best interests in the event Attorney Reich’s position on a custody change differed from that of her clients.

Connecticut State Law clearly defined that Attorney Reich’s responsibilities to go to the court to file a motion for an appointment of a GAL. Not only did Attorney Reich refuse to appoint a GAL, but she shouted down in email the Defendant’s right to confirm with her clients their informed consent about a custody change.

Not only did Attorney Reich proceed in and out of court without consulting her clients when she took positions directly opposite of her minor children responsibilities, she also then misrepresented her client’s positions in court.

Kerry Nowacki and Tim Nowacki’s positions have NEVER been stated in court by their court appointed Attorney. The positions represented to change legal and physical custody via an Ex Parte Motion for Order filed on

December 2, 2010 was a position diametrically opposite of what was in the best interests of the children.

On December 2, 2010, Attorney Reich circumvented the proper court procedures for filing this Ex Parte Motion for Order. Attorney Reich did not submit such documents through the court clerk's office. The paperwork was never time stamped into the court clerk's office. The proper procedures are continually violated by lawyers, but the orchestration of this custody coup involved the judge in the case as well.

The Ex Parte Motion for Order filed by Attorney Reich had the input of Attorney Kevin Collins as well. The construction of the Motion for Order included an acknowledgement that the Plaintiff, Suzanne Sullivan, was ready, willing and able to accept the full legal and physical custody assignment.

The transcript of the hearing on the morning of December 2 in the courtroom of Judge Taggart Adams indicated the dishonesty of Attorney Reich when she said she had no reason to be in attendance at the financial hearing being conducted in the courtroom of Judge Taggart Adams. Attorney Reich asked to be excused from the courtroom and then went to Judge Schofield's chambers to file an Ex Parte Motion for Order with her.

The sworn affidavit filed by Attorney Reich contained 37 errors which were identified to Attorney Reich. Attorney Reich refused to correct those errors and in doing so, Attorney Reich violated the Rules of Professional Conduct.

The constant errors of Attorney Reich, the intentional effort to mislead the judges, and the pernicious abuse of the Rules of Professional Conduct resulted in a Legal Malpractice lawsuit which was filed on December 14, 2009 against Attorney Reich and her law firm.

Attorney Reich retaliated again by setting up an arrest of the Defendant in regards to a series of emails which referenced a series of emails where Attorney Reich was challenged by the Defendant for her duplicitous conduct both in and out of court.

In fact, Attorney Reich was not appointed as a legal guardian of Tim and Kerry Nowacki. She was appointed as a legal representative.

As the children's representative, her role was to protect the legal interests of the children and to represent the children's expressed desire to preserve the existing parenting plans.

According to the Practice Book Rules, Attorney Reich had a legal responsibility for correcting the errors in her sworn affidavit. Once she accomplished her goal of achieving a custody coup she refused to honor the Attorney's Oath and correct her mistakes. Such violations constitute perjury.

The conduct of Attorney Reich is nothing less than a despicable example of how lawyers use the system of justice to create injustice. To misrepresent children in court, take money from a parent that could have been better used for their educations, and to create the kind of conflict Attorney Reich did to destroy the working relationship between this father and his children is simply a grievous misuse of the AMC appointment.

Attorney Reich created a structure for parenting time in the filing of her Ex Parte Motion for Order filed on December 2, which would have resulted in this parent to have had to hire a court appointed supervisor and pay that person to spend time with their father.

Not only did the children reject that proposition, they did so with conviction. The children refused to participate in court monitored parenting time with a complete stranger. Their father refused to be humiliated by Attorney Reich or the court system.

The nightly phone call with my children is taped. Attorney Reich actually has reviewed 4-5 hours of these taped conversations. Attorney Reich represents the very essence of a practitioner who puts her own financial interests ahead of those of her clients and has operated with "malice" and her own financial "best interests" at the expense of the educational funding of her two client's educational aspirations.

Attorney Reich filed a bizarre complaint with the Stamford Police Department as it related to threats and intimidation to her professional career. The emails exchanged with Attorney Reich were a reaction to the duplicitous manner she has conducted herself in this family case and in her role as the AMC.

Attorney Reich has eviscerated the Rules of Professional Conduct in the manner she has conducted herself in this case and must be held accountable in a hearing of probable cause of legal misconduct and be removed from any further appointments as an Attorney for Minor Children.

Please refer to the June 9 letter to Attorney Leonard Boyle which details the criminal allegations for misconduct for the failures of our judicial and legal systems for their appropriate contributions to legal and judicial misconduct.

All of the participants in this case of insider trading have been noticed for their contributions to the illegalities which have been perpetrated by lawyers covering for lawyers in the Grievance Committee processes and Judges covering for lawyers in making rulings which have eviscerated the Attorney's Oath and the Rules of Professional Conduct.

As Sir Walter Scott scribed with quill in 1808 in his epic poem Marmion:

"Oh what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive."

Will the Grievance Committee have the courage to act on evidence of misrepresentation of children's unspoken voice in court proceedings by a lawyer who was more interested in her fee income than the protection of the truth?

The gauntlet has been thrown and the penalty flag for roughing has been thrown onto your legal field of play. What is the penalty? Only a public hearing for probable cause will validate the authenticity of these claims.

I am asking the Grievance Committee to assign this to a panel which will allow me to meet in person to insure the evidence is properly evaluated.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Nowacki

319 Lost District Drive

New Canaan, Ct. 06840

(203) 273-4296 (cell)

(203) 966-6474 (home and fax)